



[Skip to Main Content](#) [Skip to Left Navigation](#) [Skip to Footer](#)

Department of Commerce
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER



- [Home](#)
- [About OCIO](#)
- [Contact Us](#)
- [Site Map](#)

You Are Here:

1. [OCIO Home](#) >
2. [Policy and Programs](#) >
3. [Good Guidance - Information Quality](#) > Reynolds appeal to NIST Initial Denial

Reynolds appeal to NIST Initial Denial

Morgan Reynolds, Ph.D.

26 Alta Way

Hot Springs Village, AR 71909

econrn@suddenlink.net

501-922-4592

October 26, 2007

Deputy Director

National Institute of Standards and Technology

100 Bureau Drive, Mail Stop 1000

Gaithersburg, MD 20899-1000

Dear Sir:

This letter constitutes my appeal of your initial denial letter dated September 28, 2007 to my request for correction (RFC) of March 8, 2007 pursuant to Section 515 of P.L. 106-544 (the Information Quality Act) plus my supplement to my original RFC you received on May 1, 2007.

Summary

Your initial denial is unsatisfactory because it confirms my fundamental contention that NIST has violated basic physics in its analyses and animations of airplanes allegedly striking the World Trade Center Towers, as documented below. Further, NIST has failed to demonstrate that the video and photographic data used by NIST are not fraudulent. We still have every reason to believe that they are fake since, for instance, key videos show no collision/crash ("The Immaculate Penetration") and no deceleration as the airplane image enters the south tower, a physical impossibility. NIST and I apparently agree on the fact that the videos show little or no deceleration. For these and other reasons documented below, NIST should reverse its initial denial and comply with applicable information quality guidelines and standards in a number of particular ways, including but not limited to the physical principles, facts and arguments stated herein. I also reiterate that Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC), ARA and other NIST contractors engaged in fraud and deception within the meaning of the False Claims Act (citation omitted) and did not engage in benign work as your response of September 28, 2007, essentially alleges at pgs. 2-3 thereof.

Text of Appeal to NIST

[A rational man] knows that the contradictory
is the impossible, that a contradiction cannot
be achieved in reality and that the attempt
to achieve it can lead only to
disaster and destruction.

--Ayn Rand, 1964

In its September 28 denial of my request for correction (RFC), NIST addresses me as "Mr. Morgan Reynolds." I hereby request that in future correspondence, NIST address me as Dr. Morgan Reynolds or Professor Morgan Reynolds. I earned a Ph.D. in economics in 1971 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and I am presently professor emeritus (economics) at Texas A&M University-College Station.

NIST's response to my RFC is unsatisfactory if predictable, especially since it took NIST over six months to compose its 4-page response, with only 2 pages of substance. Aside from a concession to an alleged typo correction, NIST restricts its response to only three issues I had raised: its violation of basic physics, its embrace of fake airplane videos and the conflict of interest I alleged for SAIC, a major NIST contractor. By failing to address the remainder of the objections raised in my RFC (see below, section V), it can be asserted that NIST essentially concedes their correctness. If that is incorrect, I hereby request a NIST response to the issues raised in my RFC and enumerated in section V below.

NIST denies my request for correction, but at another level NIST's response is quite useful. Why? Because NIST in two sentences admits it rejects the fundamental principles of Newtonian mechanics, "which are the foundation of much of today's engineering."¹

The NIST denial letter deals with photographic and video evidence first, but the logic of NIST's response dictates that we deal first with NIST's rejection of Newtonian mechanics. This is at the heart of our disagreement. Since NIST defends the videos as recording reality, it must reject Newtonian mechanics—the two go hand-in-hand—although its rejection of Newton is disguised. The NIST response to my RFC drops the veil.

I. NIST Versus Newton

Thousands of crashes and collisions have occurred daily throughout history. Crashes are mundane. The elementary physics of these interactions between bodies have never been known to vary. All of them have obeyed the laws of physics. Yet somehow, 9/11 was mysteriously different, or so we are told. "Both the aircraft and the towers included deformable components and materials, whose interactions were properly accounted for in the models," states NIST on p. 2 of its response. "As a result, the aircraft would not be expected to decelerate immediately upon impact with the exterior wall of the tower." This is a breathtaking two-sentence sequence that I welcome.

- Deformation of materials requires energy.
- Energy can only be spent once.
- If energy is used to deform materials, it must come from somewhere.
- Energy used to deform materials is not available to maintain constant speed.

- Unless the flying object can find a new energy source, it must slow because energy consumed deforming materials is not available to keep speed constant.

Now let us repeat NIST's claim: "...the aircraft would not be expected to decelerate immediately upon impact." Remarkable. In truth, NIST's modeling violates all three fundamental laws of Newtonian mechanics.

Under Newton's 1st law of motion, or **law of inertia**, if a plane does not decelerate upon impact with an exterior wall, no net force could have been impressed on the plane.² To restate, if a plane continues to fly at the same speed, no force has been applied to it. That is the law of inertia. NIST's assertion that we would not expect the aircraft to "decelerate immediately upon impact" against a steel wall backed by steel/concrete floors apparently contradicts Newton's first law. Since a contradiction cannot exist in nature, I can think of six possible explanations:

- (a) the 1st law never has been generally valid and/or does not apply to these kinds of interactions between bodies (Newton was wrong, for example, because the master scientist neglected to account for a time lag between impact and deceleration)
- (b) the physical law has general validity, but was temporarily suspended in New York City between 8:46 and 9:03 a.m. on 9/11, perhaps by Muslim terrorists
- (c) the twin towers and jetliners were built long after Sir Isaac Newton died and hence his old-fashioned laws could not be expected to apply to "biologically-inspired" designs over a quarter-mile tall and their interaction with jetliners
- (d) pre-9/11 mechanics no longer apply in a post-9/11 world
- (e) the law of inertia holds alright but the buildings were a figment of our imagination and there was no interaction between objects
- (f) the law of inertia holds but the planes were a figment of our imagination and there was no interaction between objects (i.e., the plane was a video insert, a TV special effect).

Engineers would be shocked to learn that Newton's first law is invalid or did not apply on 9/11 or after 9/11. Their disbelief suggests that explanations a-d can be safely rejected because Newtonian mechanics still apply. And since the Twin Towers were real by all accounts, that leaves fake videos as the most likely explanation for observing little or no deceleration.

Under Newton's 2d law, sometimes called the **law of acceleration**, if a force is applied at the front of an airplane, it must slow and the back or tail of that aircraft must slow too. Unless that is, the front is no longer in the way of the back of the plane because the front is no longer connected to the rear, and the disconnect occurred without loss of kinetic energy. Further, according to the 2d law deceleration must be proportional to the force applied. The steel/concrete Twin Towers would administer quite a force against an aluminum airplane flying at high speed.

Since NIST insists that a 159-foot-long Boeing 767 disappeared into the north tower within 0.25 seconds and into the south tower within a corrected 0.23 seconds, almost the same as their speeds in the air, no force was impressed on these planes according to Newton's second law. $\Sigma \mathbf{F} = m\mathbf{a}$ and if $\mathbf{a} = 0$, then no net force was applied. When was Newton's 2nd law repealed? I did not get the memo. If the 2d law still applies, and I believe it does, then NIST cannot possibly be right and any gashes or holes in the towers that appeared at 8:46 a.m. and 9:03 a.m. on 9/11 must have been impressed by some method other than by a no-deceleration airplane. NIST apparently forgot the lecture on the first day in engineering mechanics class.

Newton's 3d law, sometimes called the **law of reciprocal actions**, states that all forces occur in pairs and these two forces are equal in magnitude and opposite in direction. That is, the forces of action and reaction between bodies in contact have the same magnitude, same line of action, and opposite sense. Didn't NIST personnel have a tug of war when they were children? If there is a force on the building in a crash, there is an equal and opposite force on the airplane. Yet the plane does not slow down or break apart!

If an aluminum plane ran into a Twin Tower, it must crumple, shatter and could not possibly leave a jetliner-shaped, cartoon-like "silhouette of passage" because in a collision with a tremendously strong building, arguably the strongest in the world, an airplane with its far lower mass, density and strength because it is built to be lightweight, would be far less able to withstand the equal force exerted on both bodies. The airlines weigh your luggage and worry about its distribution en route while building security personnel and custodians do not worry about the weight building entrants bring in because buildings do not have to be lightweight and are built with redundant strength.

http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/woman_wtc.jpg

http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/wtc1_woman_impact-area_full_large.jpg

Strength and massiveness matter greatly in which body will fare better in withstanding the equal force of an impact. Everybody knows this in shopping for a car: should I buy a heavy SUV for safety or accept the risk of driving a lightweight econobox or sportscar? If the damage inflicted on the other body in a collision between a jetliner and a Tower were likened to a sports contest, it would be something like Tower 100, Airplane 2. Imagine, for example, that a Tower fell on the airplane instead of the aluminum airplane hitting the Tower: complete and utter devastation of the airplane. However, this mismatch is not what the videos show. Instead, the aluminum plane cuts right through steel and disappears inside the Tower. This is impossible. Structural steel is far stronger than aluminum and present in abundant quantities, and would suffer only light damage compared to complete and utter destruction/rejection of an aluminum airplane, with most of its debris scattered outside the building, especially wings, tail section and a majority of the shattered fuselage. The five floors in each Tower allegedly impacted by planes weighed more than 100X that of the alleged 140 ton airplanes. For more of this analysis, please see

http://nomoregames.net/presentations/Madison_No_Planes_Final_August_07.ppt
.htm and

http://nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=had_a_car_crash
http://nomoregames.net/911/nist_denies_prelim/64_cookieHole_dsnc1775A.jpg

Figure 1

http://nomoregames.net/911/nist_denies_prelim/65_CoyotePlate.jpg

Figure 2

http://nomoregames.net/911/nist_denies_prelim/Geewhizz.jpg

Figure 3

http://nomoregames.net/911/nist_denies_prelim/66_Roadrunner.jpg

Figure 4

ARA: <http://drjudywood.com/articles/ARA/ARA.html>

Appeal: http://drjudywood.com/pdf/070822_RFC_Appeal17a_JW.pdf

NIST RFC: http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html

II. Airplane Video Fakery

So-called live videos of the south tower plane "event" showed a plane image disappearing behind the South Tower wall, although at least one shows a plane's

nose momentarily exiting the opposite north side (Fox News Channel), then fade to black, an obvious "overshooting" error in video fakery. Subsequent videos of an airplane image entry into the south tower emerged in the days, months and years later. These "penetration" videos show impossible physics like little or no deceleration, which NIST and its contractors accept at face value. These impossibilities were modeled, allegedly via sophisticated methods, according to the NIST response to my RFC: "The models used to analyze the aircraft impact into the towers fully capture the constitutive properties of the aircraft and the building materials and account for the deformation, fracture, and failure of these materials as well as conservation of momentum and energy." NIST, of course, did no such thing. NIST did not account for the conservation of momentum and energy because energy can only be spent once. Energy consumed in fracturing tower materials and impressing a cartoon-like outline of an airliner's silhouette of passage is not available for constant speed. The event as depicted by NIST is impossible.

<http://www.acebaker.com/9-11/PinocchioStudy/Chopper5NoseOut.jpg>

http://www.voguehost.com/ims/u/ewing2001/temp_img/noseout_foxblock.jpg

NIST asserts in its defense, "By using original sources of photographic and video evidence and by using a NIST expert to obtain copies of material directly from these original sources, NIST was able to ensure the integrity of the photographic and video evidence used in the investigation. The foregoing assertion is false; and, instead, the said unidentified "expert" committed fraud within the meaning of the FCA. Further, all photographs and video records obtained by NIST are kept on a secure server with access limited only to authorized NIST personnel." Am I supposed to accept NIST assertions at face value? Does NIST deny, for example, that the FBI had custody of the Evan Fairbank video for hours and returned only part of the video to Fairbank? NIST does not comment. NIST claims it "collected photographs and videos from original sources only," yet evidence showing physically impossible events like no crash and no deceleration in the plane image must be fake unless NIST believes Newtonian mechanics no longer apply.

"Further, all photographs and video records obtained by NIST are kept on a secure server with access limited only to authorized NIST personnel," NIST asserts. Secret evidence is no evidence at all. Until shown otherwise, I am told to rely on NIST assertions, undocumented, without proof. To properly pursue my appeal, that is, confirm NIST's claims independently, I must have access to the

photographic and video evidence NIST has denied to me and other taxpayers. I have therefore filed a FOIA request on October 5, 2007 to obtain the video evidence in order to properly exercise my appeal rights.

III. Are SAIC's Hands Clean?

In my supplemental letter, I asserted that SAIC had a clear and palpable conflict of interest and offered evidence to support that proposition. "SAIC was contracted by NIST to provide administrative support to the team conducting the investigation," NIST responds. "They did not perform technical work in support of the investigation." This statement seeks to construct a distinction between types of work that does not make a significant difference. There is just as much, if not more, opportunity for manipulation in the administrative function as there is in the technical area. Moreover, as SAIC is a "technical" company, why on earth was it performing administrative work for NIST, a fully staffed governmental agency? And why contract out such work to SAIC, a company with a track record of superfund violations, a failed psy-op record (Iraq), and more employees with security clearances for weapons development than any other company in the world? NIST has yet to indicate what the nature of that administrative work consisted in. Did it facilitate a process of segmented and compartmentalized work, such that some did not know what others were doing? Another key issue to be determined is to what extent SAIC and other NIST contractors facilitated the process whereby NIST's examination of what caused the destruction of the Twin Towers ceased altogether at a point that was PRIOR to the actual event itself. That bit of fraud most assuredly required a deft administrative manipulation. Equally significant, the administrative process that could permit NIST to disregard basic physics and, instead, assert reliance on unspecified, generalized "widely accepted" "principles of structural and solid mechanics, fire behavior, and thermal analysis" while simultaneously ignoring the impossibility of what was shown in videos likewise demonstrates administrative manipulation of the type that constitutes fraud.

In short, the statement that "SAIC was contracted by NIST to provide administrative support to the team conducting the investigation," is consistent with an admission of fraud of the type I have alleged against SAIC and the other NIST contractors.

SAIC was the largest NIST contractor with 25 employees assigned, followed by Simpson, Gumpertz, & Heger Inc. with 14 and then by ARA and Hughes

Associates, Inc. with 9 each. SAIC has the most employees in defense industry with top security clearances. SAIC does not reveal the job titles and professional training of its employees and NIST likewise has kept its WTC contract with SAIC secret. I have filed a FOIA request on October 5, 2007 which the FOIA says it did not receive to obtain this NIST contract and all related evidence to discover the work SAIC performed. Subsequently, I filed a FOIA request on October 22, 2007 to obtain the NIST contracts and all related evidence to discover the work performed by SAIC and other contractors.

IV. Are ARA's Hands Clean?

My original RFC identified ARA as the principal contractor hired to analyze plane impacts and create relevant animations. I obtained these data from the NIST contract with ARA as presented on NIST's website. But NIST is silent about the role ARA played in plane analysis and animation. The NIST published contract with ARA clearly specified that ARA would perform analyses and animations of plane impacts on the towers. If accurate, ARA plainly violated Newtonian mechanics and substituted patently false physics in its analyses and animations and is therefore culpable for fraudulent and misleading misrepresentations. What role did ARA play? I await NIST's response to my FOIA of October 22 for more complete data.

V. NIST Silent On Most Issues in My RFC

NIST is silent on the remaining arguments and evidence I offered in the RFC such as no collision/crash shown in videos with south tower entry of the plane image but rather an impossible "absorption" by the building or gliding into the building without a single plane flap or wing tip disturbed, no airplane parts broken off during the "impact sequence," no plane crumpling, no separation of wing tips or tail section, the building "healing itself up" for a few frames after disappearance of the airplane image and before explosions, noiseless penetration despite the 120+ dB sound that would be heard from full throttle jet engines within 1,200 feet, the impossibility of an "invincible" aluminum airliner upon penetration followed by fragility inside the building, Tower gashes that are too small, an impossible "shredding theory," no aircraft debris showering down below the impact zones, no aircraft debris visible in the gashes, no time-change parts with unique serial parts numbers recovered and verified against each aircraft's log, and much more.

I hereby reiterate that all NIST's contractors are involved in a process of fraud, of manipulation and of deception in violation of the False Claims Act.

I also hereby request an opportunity to supplement this appeal upon receipt of FOIA information requested by me in two FOIA requests dated October 5, 2007, and one dated October 22, 2007, respectively, that have not yet been responded to by NIST, other than acknowledgment of their receipt and pendency. Copies of said FOIA requests are attached hereto for reference purposes. NIST has acknowledged by hard copy mail the October 5 FOIA request for the video data held by NIST.

http://nomoregames.net/911/nist_denies_prelim/FOIA2.jpg

http://nomoregames.net/911/nist_denies_prelim/FBI1.jpg

<http://www.911blogger.com/node/11776>

Aidan Monaghan

A Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for documentation confirming the recovery and positive identification of debris from the commercial aircraft allegedly used in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 (N334AA, N612UA, N644AA, N591UA), has been denied.

An appeal is pending.

According to the FBI, "the material requested is located in an investigative file which is exempt from disclosure pursuant to Title 5, United States Code, Section 552, subsection (b) (7) (A)."

This subsection reads: "could be reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings."

Concerns of compromising any related, unspecified and presumably pending "enforcement proceedings" did not prevent the release of government exhibits containing images of aircraft debris allegedly of United Airlines flight 93 and American Airlines flight 77, following the successful prosecution of alleged 9/11 co-conspirator Zacarias Moussaoui, on May 4, 2006:

<http://www.rcfp.org/moussaoui/jpg/size600/P200060-1.jpg>

<http://www.rcfp.org/moussaoui/jpg/size600/P200030-1.jpg>

Original FOIA request:

<http://i232.photobucket.com/albums/ee147/S1kun1t/FOIA2.jpg?t=1191324655>

VI. More Difficulties for the Official Airplane Story

Additional difficulties for NIST's airplane analysis include the fact that it and Boeing have not proven that Boeing 767s can fly 542 mph ground speed at 1,000 feet against a quartering headwind as alleged for UA Flight 175, tail number N612. A Boeing 767 can cruise at approximately 540 mph and has a top speed of approximately 590 mph at 35,000 feet. Yet the air at 1K is 3X as dense as air at 35K. Thrust must equal drag for constant speed and thus thrust with the turbofan engines intended for fuel efficiency at high altitude must increase 3-fold at 1K than 35K to sustain ground speeds around 540 mph. Boeing, American Airlines and United Airlines were "cooperating organizations" to NIST and should have been consulted to confirm that the alleged speeds on 9/11 were within the performance envelop of a relatively low-performance (compared to military aircraft) passenger sky "bus" like a 767. I seriously doubt that 767 engines can develop sufficient sustained thrust to fly 500+ mph with turbines choking on thick air, can push air aside fast enough to fly that fast, or could its air frame hold together at such speeds. Moreover, the noise pollution (120+ dBs) of such an event should have been overwhelming, yet there are virtually no confirming accounts to that effect. Similarly, the extreme speed and thrust requirement should have resulted in visible jet blast effects, rather than a glider smooth "whisper quiet"³ entry into WTC 2 as depicted in videos. The lack of any such effects confirms what NIST should have been able to determine, absent the fraud that was committed, namely, the video depictions are false, fraudulent and/or fake.

Finally, among many other challenges to the official story, NIST offers no evidence of a wake vortex in the explosions at either tower. Why not? Did NIST and its contractors fail to investigate this issue? The absence of any hint of a wake vortex suggests no airplanes struck the towers.

<http://www.acebaker.com/9-11/FetzerShow/FetzerShow.html>

I repeat my original plea:

This matter involves "information" that has been disseminated that serves a useful purpose by insuring that the completed investigation of what caused the jetliner-shaped holes in World Trade Center building numbers 1 and 2 (WTC 1, WTC 2), otherwise known as the twin towers, complies with data and information quality standards. For all of the reasons set forth below in conjunction with specific requests for correction, such quality standards have been utterly and completely violated.

Yes, data quality standards have been “utterly and completely violated” in NIST’s analysis of the destruction of the Twin Towers. I await NIST’s response to this appeal and pray that this time it not take six months.

Sincerely,

Morgan Reynolds, Ph.D.

Cc: Jerry V. Leaphart

Jsleaphart@cs.com

¹ Ferdinand P. Beer, E. Russell Johnston, Jr., and Elliot R. Eisenberg, Vector Mechanics for Engineers: Statics, 7th edition, 2004, p. 3.

² Newton in 1687 in his Mathematical Principles wrote: “Every body continues in its state of rest, or of uniform motion in a right line, unless it is compelled to change that state by forces impressed upon it.

³ I am here quoting Evan Fairbanks

Last Updated:

October 31, 2007

Questions regarding this section may be directed to the [Good Guidance - Information Quality Administrator](#)

[OCIO Home](#)

• [Policy and Programs](#)

- [IT Policy, Guidance & Legislation](#)
- [IT Capital Planning & Investment Control](#)
- [Enterprise Architecture](#)
- [E-Government](#)
- [IT Security](#)
- [IT Privacy](#)
- [Project Management](#)
- [Paperwork Reduction & Information Collection](#)
- [Good Guidance - Information Quality](#)
- [Electronic & IT Accessibility](#)
- [Forms Management](#)
- [IT Workforce](#)
- [Records Management](#)

- [IT Support Services](#)
- [Commerce IT Groups](#)
- [CIO Organization](#)

- [U.S. Department of Commerce](#)
 - [Privacy Policy](#)
 - [FOIA](#)
 - [USA.gov](#)
 - [No FEAR Act](#)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disclaimer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Forms
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information Quality	